

Mr. Speaker, this remarkable woman has dedicated her life to shaping and enriching the minds and hearts of our young people. I join with our entire community in recognizing her many years of hard work and dedication which has made such a huge impact on countless lives. Euphrates will celebrate her official retirement celebration on Saturday, September 30, 1995, in Miami. I know that my colleagues join me in honoring Euphrates Abbitt on this special day.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PROF.
EDWARD J. MURPHY

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of one of our Nation's most eminent educators and scholars, Prof. Edward J. Murphy of the University of Notre Dame Law School who passed away on July 24.

Professor Murphy taught at Notre Dame from 1957 to 1994—and during that time was acknowledged to be an unsurpassed academic authority in the area of contracts law. Professor Murphy held the first chaired law professor at Notre Dame and authored the legal textbook "Studies in Contract Law" which became the most widely used contracts textbook in the country.

Mr. Speaker, for 37 years Professor Murphy taught every student who attended Notre Dame Law School. It was my honor and good fortune to have been one of those students. Professor Murphy taught me contracts, negotiable instruments, and bills and notes and directed a senior contracts seminar in which I participated. I have no hesitancy in saying that Professor Murphy was the most outstanding teacher I have ever had. He was hard working and dedicated and possessed an unsurpassed ability to communicate even the most arcane topics. He was admired and respected by every student who ever sat in his classroom.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Murphy loved the law and he loved to teach. But what made Ed Murphy so unique was that his teaching transcended the classroom. He believed in values, in principles, and in ideals and he imparted them to his students in all that he taught. Professor Murphy believed in God and in his Catholic faith and never wavered when confronted by the forces of political correctness. As Notre Dame Law Professor Charles Rice noted, "Professor Murphy uniquely integrated faith and morality with the law. What he taught is sorely needed by law students today."

Mr. Speaker, Prof. Edward Murphy faced death as he lived his life—with courage, with dignity and with faith in God. And now I would ask this House to pay its own tribute to a man who made such a profound impact on the lives of so many. Please join me as I express my regret at the loss of Edward J. Murphy, and my profoundest condolences to Mary Ann, his wife of 41 years, his 9 children, his 22 grandchildren, and to his entire family.

THE 1995 FARM BILL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, August 30, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE 1995 FARM BILL

When Congress returns to Washington after Labor Day, it will begin action on the 1995 farm bill. Farm programs are a bewildering variety of production limits, loans, income support payments, conservation programs, export promotion, research, and rural development. This year they are caught in the debate between budget constraints and the traditional constituencies that support farm programs.

Without much doubt, these programs have contributed to the stability and strength of American agriculture. American farmers produce the safest and cheapest food supply in the world. Americans spend less than 15% of their income on food—far less than our major competitors. While the number of Americans working on farms may be small (2%), almost 20% of the country is involved in production, processing, marketing, transport, sale, and export of agricultural products. Agriculture's success strengthens the American economy.

But, like most areas of the federal budget, farm spending will be reduced over the next several years. The debate in Congress centers on the depth and composition of those cuts. Unfortunately, the congressional leadership may include major farm programs in a huge omnibus budget reconciliation bill. This seven-year budget bill will include major changes in Medicare, welfare, defense, student loans, taxes, and hundreds of other agencies and programs. It will be thousands of pages long. Because of the enormous size of the reconciliation bill, debate on the farm bill may be severely limited on the House floor. Several different farm bill proposals are pending.

SINGLE-PAYMENT PLAN

This proposal would replace all commodity programs with one yearly payment. This plan would cut farm assistance almost a half, from about \$9 billion this year to \$5 billion in 2002. Farmers would receive one reduced payment each year based on a percentage of their historical payments. Farmers would not have to raise crops to receive payments, but they would be required to maintain existing conservation plans.

One advantage of this proposal is that it separates payments from crop planting requirements, and farmers would be more free to farm according to the market. A disadvantage is that, in bad years, farm payments would still decrease, and many farmers could be forced out of business. This proposal also makes no effort to reform current conservation programs, which favor Great Plains states at the expense of hillier areas such as Southern Indiana.

LOWER TARGET PRICE PLAN

Another proposal would make equally deep cuts, but keep the basic programs. For most crops, the government currently sets a target price and pays farmers a deficiency payment when prices fall below the target. This plan would lower those target prices 2 to 3 percent each year for seven years. That means that deficiency payments would eventually be paid only if prices dropped to extremely low levels. This plan would keep the link between production and payments and

allow reforms in other programs. However, if payments are cut too low, farmers might leave the programs, threatening erosion control and other conservation efforts to protect safe drinking water.

OTHER PROPOSALS

Urban Members have proposed abolishing farm programs entirely, or reducing payments to large corporate farms. Other Members have suggested an alternative budget that still balances the budget by 2002, but makes only one-third of the cuts in farm programs described above. It is not clear which of these proposals will be considered on the House floor.

MY GOALS

I believe we should move aggressively to a market-oriented farm policy. Farmers must have increased planting flexibility to respond to world markets, and regulations must be significantly reduced. Cuts in farm programs will be necessary to balance the budget, but farmers should not bear a disproportionate share of the burden.

Regulation: Regulation should be reduced. Farm programs must be streamlined and made more flexible at the local level, with an emphasis on voluntary incentives rather than mandates. All regulations should be based on sound science, and the cost of regulations should be weighed against their benefits.

Research: Agricultural research and extension have given U.S. farmers their competitive edge. I do not believe agricultural research should be reduced. With global competition and market reforms, research should be a top agricultural priority. Research boosts production and develops innovative agricultural products, such as ethanol, soydiesel, and biodegradable ink.

Trade: The United States should aggressively act to open new markets for American farmers. We should continue strong export promotion programs to maintain U.S. market share, so long as our competitors do the same. Small businesses, such as food processors and forest product manufacturers in Southern Indiana, depend increasingly on exports for growth. U.S. export promotion programs should be aimed more at these smaller businesses.

Conservation Programs: Important conservation programs should continue. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which removes environmentally important land from production, should be targeted to more environmentally sensitive areas, such as rolling hills, waterways, and wildlife areas.

Supply Management: Programs that limit crop production should be cut back. Current production controls stabilize prices in years of surplus by removing land from production. This reduces crop supplies and increases prices. However, when U.S. farmers produce less, foreign farmers gain world market share and American agribusiness loses money. Strict supply management programs place U.S. farmers at a competitive disadvantage.

CONCLUSION

In the next few weeks, I am concerned these important considerations may be lost in the rush to complete a mammoth budget reconciliation bill. Farm legislation is too important to brush off with minimal consideration in the overall budget and reform debate.

The farm bill must maintain the strength of American agriculture and move toward free market principles. The farm bill should increase farmer flexibility, decrease regulations, preserve a safe and stable food supply, and provide family farmers with a decent return for their labor and investment.